

(b) Remarks:

The claims are 1-16 with claims 1, 5-8, 15 and 16 being independent. The Examiner required restriction between Group I, claims 1-5, 14 and 15 directed to a mesostructured film and Group II, claims 6-13 and 16 directed to a method for making the mesostructured film. The grounds for restriction are respectfully traversed.

Restriction is not warranted because the claims of both groups are directed to the same inventive concept. In Group I, claims 1 and 2-4, the film has assemblies of surfactant micelles with two or more kinds of different surfactants and with symmetric reflective surfaces facing the same direction across the entire film. In Group II, the mesostructured film is formed by forming and retaining an anisotropic surface, which is a symmetric surface and then coating the surface with, *inter alia*, two or more kinds of surfactants. Therefore, the method of Group II forms the product of Group I.

Therefore, a search of the product of Group I will necessarily include a search of the method for making the product of Group II, since the same overall inventive concept is common to both groups. Therefore, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, or, alternatively, Group II should be rejoined with Group I upon an indication of allowable subject matter under MPEP § 821.04.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse the claims of Group I, claims 1-5, 14 and 15.

An early and favorable action on the merits is requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Saxon/
Peter Saxon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FDHS_WS 1463103v1